FILE COPY

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
NOV 27 1959
JAMES R. BROWNING, Clerk

IN THE

# SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1959.

No. 548

FRANK HOLDER and FRANK REDDEN,
*Petitioners,*

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
*Respondent.*

## PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

EDGAR MUSGRAVE,
616 Insurance Exchange Bldg.,
Des Moines 9, Iowa,
*Attorney for Petitioners.*

Of Counsel:

WHITFIELD, MUSGRAVE, SELVY, FILLMORE & KELLY.

E. L. MENDENHALL, INC., 1108 Oak Street, Kansas City 6, Mo., HArrison 1-3030

IN THE

# SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1959.

No.

FRANK HOLDER and FRANK REDDEN,
*Petitioners,*

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
*Respondent.*

## PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT.

The United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit affirmed the jury conviction of Petitioners-Defendants for violation of Section 2421, Title 18, United States Code which opinion is, as yet, unreported.

The Defendants were convicted on a trial by jury in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa, Central Division, on January 16, 1959, said appeals court affirmed the conviction. The Defendants now seek a Writ of Certiorari in the United States Supreme Court under the provisions of Section 1254, Title 18, United States Code, Paragraph 1.

## QUESTION PRESENTED.

The question presented for review is whether testimony of admitted prostitutes as to immoral acts, such acts not violation of Federal Statute, committed prior to indictment in a hotel on lease to Petitioner-Holder, can be introduced on behalf of the Government to prove intent on the part of Petitioners to violate, at a later date, Section 2421, Title 18, United States Code.

## STATEMENT OF CASE.

The Petitioners were indicted by a Federal Grand Jury for a violation of Section 2421, Title 18, United States Code, said indictment being in three counts; Count 1 and 2 charging the Petitioners with transporting two females from Des Moines, Iowa, to Waynesville, Missouri, for the purposes of prostitution, and the third Count charging them with conspiracy to violate Section 2421, Title 18 of the United States Code.

At the trial, the two females allegedly transported, testified that they had left Des Moines, Iowa, and proceeded by train to Kansas City, Missouri, where they were then transported in Petitioner Holder's car to Waynesville, Missouri, and on the second trip they were transported from Des Moines to Waynesville, Missouri, in Petitioner Holder's car. Both females testified as to acts of prostitution at Waynesville and that the funds secured from said acts were turned over to Petitioners.

Testifying on behalf of the Government were Betty Jean Jennings, Sherryrie Ann Howard and Tillie Jeannette Lindsey, who each characterized herself as a prostitute and they each had committed acts of prostitution in the

Clyde Hotel in Minneapolis, Minnesota, which hotel was under lease to Petitioner Holder and Petitioner Redden, who was employed during a part of this time as a desk clerk. The Petitioners each testified in their own behalf and denied the material statements of the two females. The Petitioners at the time of the introduction of the testimony from Government witnesses Jennings, Howard and Lindsey, objected to said testimony as being immaterial and outside the issues of the indictment. It was received by the Trial Judge and instruction given to the jury that they may consider same to establish intent on the part of the Petitioners. Said testimony by witnesses Jennings, Howard and Lindsey related to acts and activity prior to the time of the acts set forth in the indictment.

Section 2421, Title 18, United States Code, defines a crime against the United States Government and gives jurisdiction to the United States District Court, thereby being the basis for federal jurisdiction in the Court in the first instance.

The Circuit Court of Appeals' decision upholding the introduction of such evidence decided an important question of Federal law which has not been, but should be settled by this Court. If this decision were allowed to stand, the Petitioners to rebut testimony of such witnesses as Jennings, Howard and Lindsey, will be called upon to answer charges wholly immaterial and foreign to the charge in the indictment. Such testimony has a tendency to create hostility, surprise and confusion of the issues and may raise a variety of false issues. It also calls upon the Petitioners to meet charges of which the indictment gives no information and tends to confuse them in their defense. Said evidence also carries with it the danger of undue prejudice.

## CONCLUSION.

For the foregoing reasons, this Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

EDGAR MUSGRAVE,
616 Insurance Exchange Bldg.,
Des Moines 9, Iowa,
*Attorney for Petitioners.*

Of Counsel:

WHITFIELD, MUSGRAVE, SELVY, FILLMORE & KELLY.

## CERTIFICATE.

I, Edgar Musgrave, Attorney for the Petitioners, and a member of the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, certify that I mailed on the 24th day of November, 1959, a copy of the foregoing Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, Washington 25, D. C., and Roy L. Stephenson, United States Attorney, U. S. Court House, Des Moines, Iowa, by depositing a copy in the United States mails, postage prepaid to the above addresses.

Edgar Musgrave.

FILE COPY

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
DEC 4 1959
JAMES R. BROWNING, Clerk

IN THE

# SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1959.

No. 548

FRANK HOLDER and FRANK REDDEN,
*Petitioners,*

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
*Respondent.*

## APPENDIX.

EDGAR MUSGRAVE,
616 Insurance Exchange Bldg.,
Des Moines 9, Iowa,
*Attorney for Petitioners.*

Of Counsel:

WHITFIELD, MUSGRAVE, SELVY, FILLMORE & KELLY.

E. L. MENDENHALL, INC., 1108 Oak Street, Kansas City 6, Mo., HArrison 1-3030

IN THE

# SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

OCTOBER TERM, 1959.

---

No.

---

FRANK HOLDER and FRANK REDDEN,
*Petitioners,*

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
*Respondent.*

---

## INDEX


| | |
|---|---|
| Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit | 1 |
| Judgment | 10 |
| Certificate | 11 |

**OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT.**

# United States Court of Appeals

## FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

No. 16,168

Frank Holder and Frank L. Redden, Appellants,

v.

United States of America, Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa.

[October 28, 1959.]

Roy W. Meadows for appellants.

Roy L. Stephenson, United States Attorney (Richard J. Wells, Assistant United States Attorney, was with him on the brief) for appellee.

Before SANBORN, WOODROUGH and MATTHES, Circuit Judges.

WOODROUGH, Circuit Judge.

Appellants, Frank Holder and Frank Redden, were indicted by a Federal Grand Jury for the Southern District of Iowa, Central Division, on three counts: Count I charging appellants with interstate transportation of Delores Mae Lovelady and Jeanne Williams from Des Moines, Iowa, to Waynesville, Missouri, for the purpose of prostitution and other immoral purposes on or about February 27, 1957. Count II charged appellants with transportation of the same two females from Des Moines, Iowa, to Waynes-

ville, Missouri, for prostitution on or about the 31st day of March, 1957. Count III charged that appellants did conspire to violate Section 2421, Title 18, by transporting or causing to be transported the same two females from Des Moines, Iowa, to Waynesville, Missouri, for the purposes of prostitution and other immoral purposes and alleged as overt acts that the appellants transported or caused to be transported, these two females from Des Moines, Iowa, to Waynesville, Missouri, for the purpose of prostitution on February 27, 1957, and March 31, 1957.

Appellants entered pleas of not guilty, were tried in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa, and convicted on all three counts on January 16, 1959.

Each appellant was sentenced to five years on each count of the indictment to run consecutively. This sentence was changed on March 6, 1959, and the sentence on Count III as to each defendant was suspended and the defendant was then placed on five years' probation to commence upon the completion of the sentences on Counts I and II which were to run consecutively.

On this appeal it is contended for reversal:

That the court erred (1) in denying each defendant's motion for acquittal for insufficiency of the evidence made at the conclusion of all the evidence; (2) in overruling motions to strike the testimony of three witnesses, Betty Jeanne Jennings, Sherryrie Ann Howard and Tillie Jeanette Lindsey; (3) in failing to instruct the jury to scrutinize and receive with care and caution the testimony of the victims of the unlawful transportation; and (4) in refusing to give requested instructions I and II.

1. As to the evidence. There is substantial evidence to the effect that:

Defendant Holder was about thirty three years of age in 1957 and lived in Minneapolis, Minnesota, where he was engaged in operating the Clyde Hotel on which he had a three year lease. Defendant Redden was about fifty one years old and worked for Holder as a clerk in the hotel. The main business of the hotel was to provide rooms for prostitutes to carry on their vocation.

Defendant Holder had an automobile in which he and co-defendant Redden drove to Des Moines, Iowa, in the last part of February, 1957. There they spent some time at a bar called the Sepia Club and established relations with the two women referred to as the victims, Delores Lovelady and Jeanne Williams. Holder had known Jeanne Williams previously and had had sexual relations with her but the bartender introduced the others. Holder told the women about his hotel in Minneapolis and "said the girls made pretty good money up there out of the hotel. And if [they] wanted to come up there some time [they] could make money from the hotel." He explained that girls brought "dates" in and that they could make from one hundred to two hundred dollars during the week. Defendants also told the women that they were then driving to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, to do some gambling and that the girls "could go along and could make some money". The women agreed. They were not to go across the state line from Iowa into Missouri in the automobile because, as defendant Holder said, "they thought they could be picked up for transporting [the girls] across state lines." Accordingly the defendants drove the women to the railroad depot in Des Moines and put them on the train for Kansas City, Missouri. The men then drove to that city in Holder's automobile and met the women there at the railroad depot. From there they drove to the Street Hotel where the women registered and paid for a room in

advance with money supplied by Redden. The defendants registered at the same hotel later in the day. All the signatures of registration were identified and conceded.

The desk clerk at the hotel in Kansas City testified that he talked to defendant Holder in the hall of the hotel and Holder told him that "he had a couple of girls" and asked the clerk to make some arrangement so Holder could make some money. Holder said the girls were prostitutes. The clerk refused.

After staying one night at the hotel and on February 28, the four drove in Holder's car to the vicinity of Waynesville, close to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, stopping for the night at a rooming house in Lebanon, Missouri, in a large room with three beds, the men and women occupying separate beds. On March first the defendants took the women to the Cactus Club located one mile and one-half outside the Fort. There they told the women to get out and mingle with the soldiers and make dates with them but not to "take no two or three dollars"; not "to charge less than ten dollars". Defendants then went about their gambling. When they returned to escort the women back to Lebanon for the night they learned that the women had not had any "dates" and defendant Holder said "What do you think I brought you whores down here for?"

The following nights they had prostitution "dates" and Lovelady obtained about sixty dollars and Williams about thirty or forty which they turned over to defendants. All returned together to Des Moines in Holder's car after four days at and around the Fort.

The second trip from Des Moines, Iowa, to Fort Leonard Wood was the subject of the second count of the indictment and occurred about one month later. There was some communication between Lovelady and Redden by

letter and telephone with the result that the four again came together at the Sepia Club in Des Moines the last of March, 1957. On the thirty first of that month Holder again used his automobile to transport the same party of four from Des Moines, Iowa, to the vicinity of Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri. They did not use the railroad on this trip but drove directly to the same house in Lebanon and occupied the same room together as on the first trip. The women again engaged in prostitution with the soldiers, the trip coinciding with soldiers' pay days and according to the testimony of the women they gave the proceeds of their prostitution on the second trip, which they said amounted to around three hundred dollars, to the defendants. They returned eighty dollars to a soldier who went to Lebanon and demanded and got back that amount which he had given to Williams. They made the return trip to Des Moines with Holder in his car.

Defendants each testified at length in defense. They admit that the women accompanied them across the state line on the second trip from Des Moines to the vicinity of Fort Leonard Wood and return but claim that the women crossed the state line from Des Moines to Kansas City, Missouri, on the first trip by themselves on the train and without solicitation or provision of funds by defendants. They deny paying the Kansas City hotel bill for the women and claim that the meeting at the hotel was not prearranged. They admit the four traveled from Kansas City to the vicinity of Fort Leonard Wood in Holder's car and returned in it to Des Moines and the defendants gambled with the soldiers at and near the Fort but claim they had nothing to do with prostitution by the women. The hotel clerk's account of his conversation in the hall of the hotel with Holder was denied. Both men swore very positively that they had never taken any money ob-

tained by prostitution from the women. Both swore that there was nothing said about prostitution in the talks with the women at Des Moines before either the first trip or the second.

The appellants argue that the evidence failed to establish that the defendants conceived of the immoral activities of the women prior to the interstate transportation and cite and rely upon *Mortensen v. United States*, 322 U.S. 369, and *Hansen v. Haff*, 291 U.S. 559, but we think the point is without merit. In their testimony the defendants picture the women as the ones eager to go on the trip for the pleasure of it and themselves as reluctantly granting permission without ulterior motive. But the women said that before they went they were told at the Sepia Club they "could go along and could make some money" and were also told of the opportunities defendants afforded girls to make money by practicing prostitution in their Clyde Hotel in Minneapolis. Sending the women by train to conceal defendants' transportation of them for fear of penalty was a circumstance to be considered. The attempt to make "arrangements" to make money out of the girls as prostitutes at the Street Hotel was indicative of preconceived intent. Also, the declaration Holder made when the women failed to make dates on their first night at the Cactus Club, "What do you think I brought you whores down here for?" We think on careful consideration of all the evidence that the ruling on the motions for acquittal was without error.

2. The government called three witnesses to transactions of the defendants not within the indictment for the limited purpose of showing intent. The court received the testimony for that purpose and so instructed the jury. These witnesses were prostitutes who used the Clyde Hotel to ply their trade during the relevant period. Their testi-

mony showed defendants' intimate familiarity with the prostitutes and their knowingly providing means and receiving compensation out of the prostitution carried on in their hotel. The witness Betty Jean Jennings, in addition to testifying to numerous acts of prostitution at the hotel which were brought directly to the knowledge of both defendants, also testified concerning a trip she made to Faribault, Minnesota, in Holder's car accompanied by both appellants and another prostitute where prostitution was engaged in by the women while the men gambled and some of the proceeds of the prostitution were turned over to Holder.

It is plain that the conduct of defendants in connection with prostitution and their use of prostitutes as shown by the three witnesses threw light on the intent of defendants in procuring the women to make the trips in issue here. Here the invitation was given the victims at the first meeting at the Sepia Club in Des Moines to come to the Clyde Hotel and assurance was given them of the money to be made with the means provided by defendants for practicing prostitution there. The jury could well infer a continuing intent on the part of defendants to benefit from the receipts from prostitution. The court did not err in refusing to strike the testimony of the three prostitutes. *Wiley* v. *United States*, 8 Cir., 257 F.2d 900; *Neff* v. *United States*, 8 Cir., 105 F.2d 688.

3. The court instructed the jury fully and fairly as to their duty in passing upon the credibility of witnesses and weighing their testimony but there was no request to instruct specially in respect to the testimony of the victims Lovelady and Williams. They had been examined and cross-examined at great length and their background and character together with what had been said and done in

connection with the trip were laid bare to the jury. In vital respects they were strongly corroborated.

We do not find reversible error in the omission to caution the jury about the weight to be given their testimony. Where no request for an instruction is made reversal of a judgment will rarely be made for failure to give it unless it constitutes a basic and highly prejudicial error. *Cave* v. *United States*, 8 Cir., 159 F.2d 464, 469. Such was not the situation here. *Stoneking* v. *United States*, 8 Cir., 232 F.2d 385, 391 and 392.

4. Appellants assert error in the refusal of the court to give requested instructions I and II "to the effect that if the jury found that the trip to Fort Leonard Wood was for a legitimate purpose and incidental thereto intercourse was had, the appellants would not have violated the statute."

The court instructed in four instructions that the burden was upon the government to prove beyond reasonable doubt as to each defendant and each count "* * * that his purpose in transporting the women was to have them engage in prostitution * * *" and in instruction number 14:

> "If a person knowingly transports or causes to be transported any woman across a state line for the purpose of prostitution, his guilt of the offense defined in the statute is complete the instant when the interstate border for entrance into the State of destination is crossed during the transportation."

These instructions made it perfectly clear to the jury that if there was any failure to prove that the defendants or either of them had the purpose they were charged with in transporting the women across the state line there should be an acquittal. Though it was open to defendants to argue that there was some other purpose than that

charged, it was not incumbent on the court to hypothesize defenses for which there was no substantial support in the evidence. The instructions sufficiently informed the jury on the law.

We find the trial and conviction to be without reversible error.

Affirmed.

A true copy.

Attest:

*Clerk, U. S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit.*

**JUDGMENT.**

# United States Court of Appeals

## FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT.

No. 16168 - - - October Term, 1959

Frank Holder and Frank L. Redden,
Appellants,

vs.

United States of America.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the record from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration Whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgments and sentences of the said District Court, in this cause, be, and the same are hereby affirmed.

And it is further Ordered by this Court that the defendants in the said District Court, Frank Holder and Frank L. Redden, do surrender themselves to the custody of the United States Marshal for the Southern District of Iowa, if not now in custody, in execution of the judgments and sentences imposed upon each of them, within thirty (30) days from and after the date of filing of the mandate of this Court in the said District Court.

November 30, 1959

## CERTIFICATE.

I, Edgar Musgrave, Attorney for the Petitioners, and a member of the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, certify that I mailed on the 2 day of December, 1959, a copy of the foregoing Appendix to the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, Washington 25, D. C., and Roy L. Stephenson, United States Attorney, U. S. Court House, Des Moines, Iowa, by depositing a copy in the United States mails, postage prepaid to the above addresses.

Edgar Musgrave

EDGAR MUSGRAVE.

FILE COPY

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
DEC 24 1959
JAMES R. BROWNING, Clerk

No. 548

# In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1959

FRANK HOLDER AND FRANK L. REDDEN, PETITIONERS

*v.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

*ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT*

## BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

J. LEE RANKIN,
*Solicitor General,*
MALCOLM R. WILKEY,
*Assistant Attorney General,*
BEATRICE ROSENBERG,
RICHARD W. SCHMUDE,
*Attorneys;*
*Department of Justice,*
*Washington 25, D. C.*

## INDEX


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Opinion below | 1 |
| Jurisdiction | 1 |
| Question presented | 2 |
| Statutes involved | 2 |
| Statement | 3 |
| Argument | 7 |
| Conclusion | 9 |


## CITATIONS

Cases:


| | |
|---|---|
| *Baish* v. *United States*, 90 F. 2d 988 | 8 |
| *Bracey* v. *United States*, 142 F. 2d 85, certiorari denied, 322 U.S. 762 | 8 |
| *Brent* v. *United States*, 134 F. 2d 861 | 8 |
| *Caminetti* v. *United States*, 242 U.S. 470 | 8 |
| *Cohen* v. *United States*, 120 F. 2d 139 | 8 |
| *Daigle* v. *United States*, 181 F. 2d 311 | 7 |
| *Deason* v. *United States*, 254 Fed. 259 | 8 |
| *Dunn* v. *United States*, 190 F. 2d 496 | 8 |
| *Ehrlich* v. *United States*, 238 F. 2d 481 | 8 |
| *Hoke* v. *United States*, 227 U.S. 308 | 8 |
| *Kirby* v. *United States*, 160 F. 2d 373 | 8 |
| *Lawrence* v. *United States*, 162 F. 2d 156 | 7 |
| *Lindsey* v. *United States*, 227 F. 2d 113, certiorari denied, 350 U.S. 1008 | 7 |
| *Long* v. *United States*, 160 F. 2d 706 | 7 |
| *Mortensen* v. *United States*, 322 U.S. 369 | 8 |
| *Neff* v. *United States*, 105 F. 2d 688 | 8 |
| *Riddell* v. *United States*, 244 Fed. 695, certiorari denied, 245 U.S. 668 | 8 |
| *Tedesco* v. *United States*, 118 F. 2d 737 | 8 |
| *United States* v. *Pape*, 144 F. 2d 778, certiorari denied, 323 U.S. 752 | 7 |
| *United States* v. *Reginelli*, 133 F. 2d 595, certiorari denied, 318 U.S. 783 | 7 |
| *Wiley* v. *United States*, 257 F. 2d 900 | 7 |
| *Williamson* v. *United States*, 207 U.S. 425 | 8 |


Statutes:


| | |
|---|---|
| 18 U.S.C. 371 | 3 |
| 18 U.S.C. 2421 | 2, 3, 7 |

# In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1959

No. 548

FRANK HOLDER AND FRANK L. REDDEN, PETITIONERS

*v.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

*ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT*

## BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

### OPINION BELOW

The opinion of the court of appeals (Vol. III, 1-9) is not yet reported.[1]

### JURISDICTION

The judgment of the court of appeals was entered on October 28, 1959 (Vol. III, 10). The petition for a writ of certiorari was filed on November 27, 1959. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

[1] The record consists of three volumes. Volume I is the transcript of testimony in the district court and contains two sections which are consecutively paginated. Volume I will be referred to as "Tr".

## QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether, in a prosecution for the interstate transportation of two women for purposes of prostitution, the testimony of other prostitutes who had dealings with the defendants was properly received as bearing on the issue of intent.

## STATUTES INVOLVED

18 U.S.C. 2421 provides in pertinent part:

> Whoever knowingly transports in interstate or foreign commerce * * * any woman or girl for the purpose of prostitution or debauchery, or for any other immoral purpose, or with the intent and purpose to induce, entice, or compel such woman or girl to become a prostitute or to give herself up to debauchery, or to engage in any other immoral practice; or
>
> Whoever knowingly procures or obtains any ticket or tickets, or any form of transportation or evidence of the right thereto, to be used by any woman or girl in interstate or foreign commerce * * * in going to any place for the purpose of prostitution or debauchery, or for any other immoral purpose, or with the intent or purpose on the part of such person to induce, entice, or compel her to give herself up to the practice of prostitution, or to give herself up to debauchery, or any other immoral practice, whereby any such woman or girl shall be transported in interstate or foreign commerce * * *
>
> Shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

* * * * *

## STATEMENT

A three-count indictment returned in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa charged petitioners with the interstate transportation of women for purposes of prostitution, in violation of the "White Slave Traffic Act" of 1910, 18 U.S.C. 2421, *supra*, and with conspiring to commit this offense, in violation of 18 U.S.C. 371 (Vol. II, 1-2). Following a jury trial, petitioners were convicted and sentenced to five years' imprisonment on each count, the sentences to run consecutively (Vol. II, 80-81). On a motion to reduce sentences, the district court suspended the sentences of each petitioner on count three and placed each petitioner on probation for five years on that count, the probationary period to commence after service of the consecutive sentences on counts one and two (Vol. II, 99-102). On appeal, the judgments were affirmed.

The evidence may be summarized as follows:

1. In late February 1957, in Des Moines, Iowa, petitioners asked Mrs. Delores Lovelady and Mrs. Jean Williams whether they would like to make a trip with them to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri (Tr. 5-8; see Tr. 96-97).[2] Petitioner Holder had previously spoken to Mrs. Williams about having "dates for money" (Tr. 136). The women consented to the trip and were driven by the petitioners to the railroad terminal at Des Moines, where the women boarded a train for

[2] In the course of this conversation, petitioner Holder told the women that he owned a hotel in Minneapolis, Minnesota, and that the girls at his hotel made between $100 and $200 a week by bringing their dates there. He told the women that they, too, could make substantial sums if they wanted to go to Minneapolis (Tr. 10-11).

Kansas City, Missouri. Holder provided the money for Mrs. Williams' train fare. Mrs. Lovelady used her own money, but was reimbursed in Kansas City by petitioner Redden (Tr. 10, 97). Petitioners told Mrs. Lovelady that the women would travel by train because the petitioners did not want to run the risk of transporting women across a state line (Tr. 9; see Tr. 98, 132).

Petitioners, who traveled from Des Moines to Kansas City in Holder's car, met the women at a train depot in Kansas City. After spending the night in a local hotel, the women occupying a separate room,[3] the four rode in Holder's car to Lebanon, Missouri, where they secured a room for that night (Tr. 13-16). On the following day, the women were driven to the "Cactus Club", a night club located outside of Waynesville, Missouri, which was frequented by soldiers from nearby Fort Leonard Wood (Tr. 17-19, 195-196). Petitioners told the women that there was a lot of money that could be made from the soldiers, that they were to fill dates with soldiers, that they were not to charge under ten dollars and that they were not to mention that they had come from Des Moines (Tr. 18-19, 107-108). When Mrs. Williams said that she would not go through with this arrangement, Holder asked the women what they thought he had brought them "out here for" (Tr. 108). Subsequently, petitioners called for the women at the club. When informed that the women had not done "any good", Holder expressed anger.

---

[3] Holder told the night clerk at this hotel that he, Holder, had two prostitutes in the hotel. He asked the night clerk to make the "arrangements" so that he, Holder, could make some money. When the clerk refused, Holder said that the women would have to be taken elsewhere (Tr. 160, 163).

(Tr. 20, 110). On the following night, before the women were returned to the "Cactus Club", Redden told Mrs. Lovelady that "[i]f you girls don't make no money you will have to do something to get back to Des Moines, because we [petitioners] don't have any money." (Tr. 21). That night and the following night, the women engaged in prostitution with soldiers and turned over their receipts to petitioners. (Tr. 22-25, 111-114). On the fourth night at the "Cactus Club", the women did not fill any dates. The women were returned to Des Moines in Holder's car and petitioners proceeded on to Minneapolis (Tr. 117).

In late March 1957,[4] petitioners transported the same women from Des Moines to Lebanon, Missouri, in Holder's car (Tr. 29-30, 118-119). Operating out of the "Cactus Club", the women engaged in prostitution and turned their receipts over to petitioners (Tr. 32-34, 119-121). After three or four nights there, petitioners returned to Des Moines with the women.

2. During its case-in-chief, the government called three prostitutes who testified that they knew petitioners and that they would sometimes bring their "dates" to the Clyde Hotel in Minneapolis. Holder and Redden worked at this hotel, which was leased to Holder (Tr. 306, 342-343). The prostitutes testified that this occurred during 1956 and 1957; that their "dates" would sign the register at the Clyde Hotel and pay the two-dollar room bill; and that either Holder or Redden would assign the couple a room, depending on which one was desk clerk at the time (Tr. 226-231,

[4] Sergeant Scott testified that payday for the soldiers at Fort Leonard Wood was on the last day of the month unless that day fell on a Sunday, in which event payday would fall on a weekday (Tr. 220).

232-235, 239, 241-243, 247-248).[5] Mrs. Jennings, the first of the prostitutes called by the government, testified that in August of 1957 she traveled with petitioners, one Harris and another prostitute in Holder's car to Fairbault, Minnesota, for purposes of engaging in prostitution with men from a nearby cannery (Tr. 229-230). She testified that she and the other woman engaged in prostitution, that she gave her receipts to Harris, and that the other woman turned over her receipts to one of the petitioners (Tr. 229-230, 236-238).[6]

The trial court overruled petitioners' objections to this line of testimony, admitting it as relevant to petitioners' knowledge and intent at the times the acts charged in the indictment were committed (Tr. 226-227, 240). In the instructions to the jury, the trial judge charged, in part (Vol. II, 69):

> In considering the conduct of the defendants before and after the alleged transportation you may

---

[5] The first prostitute testified that she had brought her dates to the Clyde Hotel from July through December of 1957, and that she would occupy a room for about five minutes or less (Tr. 226, 228, 231). She also testified that she was arrested for prostitution at the Clyde Hotel in August and December of 1957 (Tr. 231). The second prostitute testified that she had brought her dates to the Clyde Hotel before Holder "owned" it, as well as when the petitioners had operated the hotel, and that she had spoken with petitioners on several occasions about finding a "trick" (Tr. 243-244). The third prostitute testified that in late 1956 and throughout 1957 she had brought some of her dates to the Clyde Hotel, and that Holder was present when she was arrested at the Clyde Hotel in April of 1957 for occupying a room with a man (Tr. 247-248).

[6] In its rebuttal, the government called a fourth prostitute who testified that in February of 1958 she lived in the Clyde Hotel, and that, in January and February of 1958 she gave some of her earnings as a prostitute to Redden (Tr. 403, 404).

consider the testimony of other witnesses in this case as to alleged misconduct by the defendants with such witnesses as bearing on the defendants' intent to commit the crimes here alleged. You may not conclude, however, that proof of such misconduct is proof of the crimes alleged here. Such evidence with reference to other alleged misconduct principally were these prostitutes who testified. Such evidence was received and may be considered by you for the limited purpose of bearing on the question of intent of the defendants to commit the crimes charged.

ARGUMENT

Petitioners contend (Pet. 3) that the testimony of the "other" prostitutes was erroneously admitted because it was "wholly immaterial and foreign to the charge in the indictment". It is well settled, however, that in prosecutions under the "White Slave Traffic Act", 18 U.S.C. 2421, *supra*, evidence of the defendant's immoral or criminal conduct, apart from that charged in the indictment, is admissible as bearing on the defendant's intent to commit the acts charged, provided the conduct is similar and reasonably connected in time. *Daigle* v. *United States*, 181 F. 2d 311, 313 (C.A. 1); *United States* v. *Pape*, 144 F. 2d 778, 780-781 (C.A. 2), certiorari denied, 323 U.S. 752; *United States* v. *Reginelli*, 133 F. 2d 595, 598 (C.A. 3), certiorari denied, 318 U.S. 783; *Lindsey* v. *United States*, 227 F. 2d 113, 116-117 (C.A. 5), certiorari denied, 350 U.S. 1008; *Wiley* v. *United States*, 257 F. 2d 900, 906-907 (C.A. 8); *Lawrence* v. *United States*, 162 F. 2d 156, 159 (C.A. 9); *Long* v. *United States*, 160 F.

2d 706, 709 (C.A. 10); *Baish* v. *United States*, 90 F. 2d 988, 990 (C.A. 10); *Tedesco* v. *United States*, 118 F. 2d 737, 740 (C.A. 9); *Neff* v. *United States*, 105 F. 2d 688, 691-692 (C.A. 8); *Brent* v. *United States*, 131 F. 2d 861 (C.A. 5); *Dunn* v. *United States*, 190 F. 2d 496, 498 (C.A. 10); *Cohen* v. *United States*, 120 F. 2d 139, 140 (C.A. 5); *Kirby* v. *United States*, 160 F. 2d 373 (C.A. 8). See *Hoke* v. *United States*, 227 U.S. 308, 325; *Williamson* v. *United States*, 207 U.S. 425, 450-451; *Ehrlich* v. *United States*, 238 F. 2d 481, 484 (C.A. 5); *Bracey* v. *United States*, 142 F. 2d 85, 88 (C.A.D.C.), certiorari denied, 322 U.S. 762; *Riddell* v. *United States*, 244 Fed. 695, 699-700 (C.A. 9), certiorari denied, 245 U.S. 668; *Deason* v. *United States*, 254 Fed. 259, 260 (C.A. 5). The testimony of the three prostitutes as to their business relationships with petitioners showed that petitioners used these prostitutes for their own monetary gain. Since petitioners' intent in transporting the women named in the indictment was an issue which required proof beyond a reasonable doubt (*Caminetti* v. *United States*, 242 U.S. 470, 485, 491; *Mortensen* v. *United States*, 322 U.S. 369, 374-375), the testimony in question was properly admitted on that issue. By appropriate instructions to the jury, it was limited to that permissible purpose.

## CONCLUSION

The decision below is correct and the petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

J. LEE RANKIN,
*Solicitor General.*

MALCOLM R. WILKEY,
*Assistant Attorney General.*

BEATRICE ROSENBERG,
RICHARD W. SCHMUDE,
*Attorneys.*

DECEMBER 1959.

☆ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1959 934804 915